

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

KAREN E. JOHNSON,

Defendant and Appellant.

B260809

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. LA075211)

THE COURT:\*

Defendant and appellant Karen E. Johnson (defendant) appeals from the order denying her petition for resentencing under the provisions of Proposition 47 which reduce some felony theft offenses to misdemeanors. Her appointed counsel filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*), raising no issues. On July 1, 2015, we notified defendant of her counsel's brief and gave her leave to file, within 30 days, her own brief or letter stating any grounds or argument she might wish to have considered. That time has elapsed, and defendant has submitted no brief or letter. We have reviewed the entire record, and finding no arguable issues, affirm the order.

---

\* ASHMANN-GERST, Acting P.J., CHAVEZ, J., HOFFSTADT, J.

In 2014, prior to the passage of Proposition 47, a jury convicted defendant of two counts of second degree burglary, in violation of Penal Code Section 459, and two counts of grand theft of property valued in excess of \$950, in violation of Penal Code section 487, subdivision (a). Defendant was sentenced on the charges. We affirmed the judgment in a nonpublished opinion, *People v. Johnson* (Dec. 10, 2014, B254827). After the passage of Proposition 47, defendant filed a petition for recall of her sentence and reduction of her convictions to misdemeanors. (See Pen. Code, §§ 1170.18, 459.5, 490.2.) On November 24, 2014, the trial court denied the petition upon finding that the value of the property taken exceeded \$950, and that the jury made an express finding to that effect. Defendant filed a timely notice of appeal from the order.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that defendant's attorney has fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issue exists. We conclude that defendant has, by virtue of counsel's compliance with the *Wende* procedure and our review of the record, received adequate and effective appellate review of the judgment entered against her in this case. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 123-124.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.